

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on August 26, 2005.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 15, 16, 18, 20, 25 and 26 are amended, claims 21 - 24 are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1 – 20 and 25 - 28 are now pending in this application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 16 was indicated to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action. As discussed in more detail below, claim 16 has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and is believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 2 and 26 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As discussed in more detail below, claims 1 and 25 have been amended to include some of the limitations of claims 2 and 26, respectively, and are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 5 and 16 were objected to due to informalities. In claim 5, line 1 has been amended to change “the graphics command data” to “the pixel-stream formatted graphics command data”. Claim 16 has been amended to distinguish between the unformatted and formatted command data. Based on these amendments, the objection to claims 5 and 16 is believed to be overcome.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 15-18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.

Claims 15, 16, 18 and 20 have been amended to change the term “output data” in line 6 to “the formatted output data”. The language was inadvertently left out in the prior amendment. As recited in these claims, the formatted command data and formatted output data are communicated between the first and second interfaces over the high-speed data path. The output interface of the coprocessor, on the other hand, provides the output data to the I/O device. Applicants submit that the language in the amended claims is consistent with the specification and that the rejection of claims 15-18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, has been overcome.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 3-5, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17-25, 27 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hudepohl et al. (U.S. 6,754,804) in view of Deering et al. (U.S. 6,753,870).

Claims 6-9, 12 and 13 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hudepohl et al. in view of Deering et al. and further in view of Wichman et al. (U.S. 2004/0227763).

Claims 8, 9, 12 and 13 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hudepohl et al. in view of Deering et al. and further in view of Rostoker et al. (U.S. 5,761,516).

The Examiner states on page 9 section 12 of the Office Action dated 8/26/05 that “the prior art fails to suggest or teach, in combination with the remaining elements, the first and second graphics interfaces further comprising first and second drivers, respectively as recited in claims 2, 16 and 26.” Applicants concur with the analysis. Independent claims 1, 15 and 25 have been amended to include the first and second drivers as previously recited in claims 2, 16 and 26 respectively. Independent claims 18 and 20 have also been amended to recite the first and second drivers. In view of this, Applicants submit that claims 1, 15, 18, 20 and 25 are in condition for allowance. Applicants further submit that dependent claims 2 – 14, 19 and 26 – 28 are allowable at least because of their dependency on their respective independent claim.

Document Not Provided on Form 892

The Examiner used the reference Wichman et al. (U.S. 2004/0227763) in the rejection of claims 6-9, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) above. However, Applicant notes that this document was not listed on an 892 Form. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner provide an 892 Form with said document listed thereon in the next communication.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. Reconsideration is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney, Greg Gorrie at (480) 659-3314, or Applicant's below-named representative to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,
LAWRENCE A. BOOTH, JR. ET AL.
By their Representatives,
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER &
KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 349-9592

Date Oct. 18, 2005

By Ann M. McCrackin
Ann M. McCrackin
Reg. No. 42,858

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 18 day of October 2005.

John D. Gorrie, Wallal
Name

David Janice McFaul
Signature